

Applicant Initiated Interview - Statement of Substance

Application No.: 10/675,431 First Named Applicant: Terry Hamer
Examiner: Chelcie L. Daye Art Unit: 2161 Status of Application: Pending

Participants:

(1) Examiner Daye (2) Andrew R. Smith
(3) _____ (4) _____

Date of Interview: September 11, 2008 10:30 (AM)

Type of Interview:

(1) Telephonic (2) Personal (3) Video Conference

Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: YES NO

If yes, provide brief description: _____

Issues Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) <u>Rej.</u>	<u>1-11, 21 &</u> <u>23-26</u>	<u>De L'Etraz &</u> <u>Cheah</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(2) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Continuation Sheet Attached

Brief Description of Arguments Presented:

The examiner and the Applicant's representative Andrew R. Smith (below-signed) discussed the prior art of record and the difference between the claims, previous claim amendments, and the art of record. No exhibits, illustrations, prior art, prior art rejections, or any other pertinent matters were discussed during the telephonic interview. Examiner and applicant discussed the significance of amendments to the admin and change routine limitations in the independent claims and new claim 85. Examiner agreed that the amendments were not disclosed in the art of record, as currently understood, and further examination of these references and search was required.



Andrew R. Smith (62,162)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature)